

Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3655 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	то	BE COMPLETED	BY PLANNING	STAFF
FILE NUMBER 2	10-010		COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		DATE
REZONING FILE N	JMBER			BY
	T	O BE COMPLET (PLEASE PR	ED BY APPLIC	CANT
ADDRESS OF PROP PROTESTED	<u> </u>	Shamroc	k Br., Ca	mpbell, CA 95008
ASSESSOR'S PARC	ELNUMBER(S)	414-04	-012-	
REASONOF PROTI		ause See Attach	ment A	
		Use separate si	heet if necessary	
The property in vis situated at: (de	vhich I own an undi	rided interest of at lea or address and Asse	ast 51%, and on b	ehalf of which this protest is being filed,
354 .	Shamroch		pell, Ct	- 95008, assesor
and is now zone	ed <u>RI-8</u>		_ District. (in Sa	ınta Clara County)
The undivided in	terest which I own in	the property descrit	oed in the stateme	nt above is a:
💢 Fee	Interest (ownership)			
Leas	ehold interest whic	h expires on	 -	
Othe	ж: (explain)			
		<u> </u>		
				

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or percel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINTNAME Brenda Friederich		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS 4 Shamroch Tor,	Campbell	CA CA	ATE	ZIPCODE 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarizant) 7cm 2			DATE /z	3/10
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRES\$	СПҮ	Sì	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	_
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	Sī	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПҮ	Sī	TATE	ZíPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПУ	Si	TATE.	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	ĊПY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Usesaparal	te sheet if necessary	,		

STATE OF CALIFO	RNIA)	•	
COUNTY OF	NTA CLARA) ss.)		
acknowledged to m that by kin hor/their	e that he she they executed t	the same in his tie	Notary Public, personally ay who proved to me on the basis scribed to the within instrumen the capacity (ies), or the entity upon behalf of whi	and
paragraph is true a		r the laws of the	State of California that the for TRACY L. NEWQUIST Commission # 1810755 Nolary Public - Celffornia Santa Giara County	
	iary Public	S.	My Comm. Expires Ave 24, 20 (Seal)	112
STATE OF CALIFO)) ss.)		
Oa	bcfore me,		, Notary Public, personally a who proved to me on the basis	
acknowledged to m that by his/her/their	e that he/she/they executed (name(s) is/are subs the same in his/het	scribed to the within instrumen t/their authorized capacity(ies), or the entity upon behalf of whi	t and and
I certify under PEN paragraph is true ar		the laws of the	State of California that the for	egoing
WITNESS o	ny hand and official seal.			
Not	ary Public		(Seal)	

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Prezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Prezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

- 1. <u>Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest</u>. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. <u>Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property.</u> My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6056 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

REZONINGFILE NUMBER TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (BLEASE RRINTORTYPE) ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING, PROTESTED 13 Salerno Dr. (Amphel) (A 95004 ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) Use separate sheef if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 1131 Salerno Dr. (Amphel) (A 95008) UILL 02 - 045 and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:	TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT SOFPROPERTY BEING ED 1/3 SAIGNS OF CANGACII. (A 35 DOT OFFROTEST Ist the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary roperty in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, aled at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 3 Saicone Dr. Cangacii. (A 95 DOT) Ist the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A District. (in Santa Clara County)		2011	1107 110 11			
OUAD# ZONING GENERAL PLAN REZONINGFILENUMBER TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (FLEASERING AT THE PROTESTED 1/3) SAPECIAL OF CAMPBELL (A 9500) ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED 1/3! SAPECIAL OF CAMPBELL (A 9500) REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 1) 3 Salacrop Dr. (Ampbell) DA 95008 UIV - 02 - 045 and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:	ZONING GENERAL DATE BY APPLICANT STOPPING STOPPROPERTY BEING PLAN STOPPROPERTY BEING PLAN STOPPING PLAN PLAN		TO/B	É COMPLETE	DBY PLANNIP	G STAFF	
REZONINGFILE NUMBER TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE RRINTORTS/PE) ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING, PROTESTED 13 Salern Dr. Langbell (A 9500) ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) HEASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 1131 Salarno Dr. Langbell (A 9500) Ull 02 - 045 and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:	TOPE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE RINT OR TYPE) SOF PROPERTY BEING, FED 3 Salegno Dr. (anghel) (a 35000) OPERATE LIMBER(S) OPERATE LIMBER(S) Use separate sheel if necessary reperty in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, aled at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 3 Salegno Dr. (anghel) A 95000 I now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) Individed interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on	FILENUMBER	C10-010				
TO:BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE RRINEORTYPE). ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING, PROTESTED 3 2 2 2 2 ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) HEASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)	TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (PLEASE PRINT ON TYPE) SOF PROPERTY BEING ED 3 Salegne Dr. (Amphel) (A 35000) PRIS PARCEL NUMBER(S) USe separate sheet if necessary reperty in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, and at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 3 Salegne Dr. (Amphel) (A 95000) Individed interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: District. (in Santa Clara County) Leasehold interest which expires on	QUAD#	ZONING	1 '			
ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING, PROTESTED 3 Salegna Dr. (Angbel) (A 95000) ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) Use separate sheet If necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 13 Salegna Dr. (Angbel) A 95000 U U - 02 - 045 and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:	SOFPROPERTYBEING FED 3 Salerna Dr. (amphel) (a 95000) ORIS PARCEL NUMBER(S) OFPROTEST Ist the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet If necessary reporty in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filled, alled at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 3 Salerna Dr. (amphel) District. (in Santa Clara County) Is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) Individed interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on	REZONINGFILEN	NUMBER	PLAN			BY
ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING, PROTESTED 3 Salerna Dr. (Angbell) (A 95000) ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) LIVEN DY ON ONE SEE Attachment A Use separate sheet If necessary The property in which I own an undivided Interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 13 Salerna Dr. (Angbell) M 95008 U U - 02 - 045 and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:	SOFPROPERTY BEING, ED 3 Salegna Dr. Lampbel (A 95000) OFPROTEST Stillne proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet If necessary roperty in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filled, aled at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 3 Salegna Dr. Lampbel Parcel Number 3 Salegna Dr. Lampbel Parcel Number anow zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) Individed Interest which Lown in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on						
PROTESTED 3 Salegna Dr. (Anghel) (A 35004 ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) HEASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 13 Salegna Dr. (Anghel) PA 95008 U - 02 - 045 and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:	See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary reperty in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filled, aled at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 3 Salcone Dr. (ampbel) Parcel Number) 5 Salcone Dr. (ampbel) Parcel Number) 6 new zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) 1 Individed Interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: 1 Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on		Namada Andrews (Namada Andrews (Namada Andrews (Namada Andrews (Namada Andrews (Namada Andrews (Namada Andrews	PLEASER	RINT OF TYPE)		
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) PEASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 1131 Section Dr. (Ampbel) 19 95008 UILL-02-045 and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:	OFPROTEST Ist the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary reperty in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, aled at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 3 Salwne Dr. (Ampbel) M 95008 In ow zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) Individed interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on		OPERTYBEING (13) Salecoa	Dr. Car	opell (A 9500	09
Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) [13] Salcono Dr. (ampbel) Da 95008 [14] O2 - O45 and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:	Use separate sheet If necessary roperty in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filled, aled at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 3 Salcone Dr. (Ampbell) PA 95008 a now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) Individed Interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on	ASSESSOR'S PAR	CELNUMBER(S)	ςς,	y		
Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) [1] 3 Salerne Dr. (Ampbel) Pa. 95008 Ulu-02-045 and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:	Use separate sheet If necessary reperty in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, aled at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 3 Sal-cone Dr. (Ampbel) PA 95008 - 02 - 045 s now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) Individed interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on			- '			
Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) [1] 3 Salerne Dr. (Ampbel) Pa. 95008 Ulu-02-045 and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:	Use separate sheet If necessary reperty in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filed, aled at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 3 Sal-cone Dr. (Ampbel) PA 95008 - 02 - 045 s now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) Individed interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on	I protest the pr	oposed rezoning becar	use See Attac	hment A	<u> </u>	
The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) [1] 3 Sal-core Dr. (ampbel) P. 95008 [1] - 02 - 045 and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:	roperty in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filled, aled at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 3 Sal-core Dr. (Arngbel) P 95008 - 02 - 045 now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) Individed interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on						
The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) [1] 3 Sal-crop Dr. (Armpbel)	roperty in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of which this protest is being filled, aled at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 3 Sal-core Dr. (Arngbel) P 95008 - 02 - 045 now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) Individed interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on						
is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) [1] Salarno Dr. (ampbel) P. 95008 [1] Unit O2 - 045 [2] and is now zoned R1-8 [3] District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:	ated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) 3 Salerne Dr. Lampbell 19 95008 - 02 - 045 s now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) addivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership)			Use separate	sheet If necessar	<u>y</u>	
and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:	3 Sal-tone Dr. Lampbell District. (in Santa Clara County) s now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) Individed interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on	The property in is situated at:	n which I own an undivi describe property by	ided interest of at address and Ass	least 51%, and or essor's Parcel N	n behalf of whi lumber)	ch this protest is being file
and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:	now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) Individed interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on	1131	Saleono Di	· Lamph	ell M	95008	′
and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:	now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa Clara County) Individed interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on	11/1/207	- 045	- 1-19	1		
The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:	ndivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on	414	- / -		_		
The undivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a:	ndivided interest which I own in the property described in the statement above is a: Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on	and is now zo	aned R1-8		District. ('in	Santa Clara	a County)
	Fee Interest (ownership) Leasehold interest which expires on						-
<u> </u>	Leasehold interest which expires on	The undivided	interest which I own in	the property desc	ribed in the state	ment above is	a:
Fee Interest (ownership)	_	☑ F	ee Interest (ownership)				
Leasehold interest which expires on	_		easehold interest which	expires on			
_		_					
	<u> </u>	Цο	ител: (ежрталт) ———				

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

Zoning Projest pmES(Application Rev. 5/2/2008

SIGNATURE(S) C	F PROTESTA	ANT(S)		
This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an which such profest is filled, such interest being not merel remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed a en eligible profest site is a legal entity other then a pers duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) members of the association.	ly an easement. A in "owner" for pury on or persons, th in legal entity is a	A tenant under a poses of this pro e protest petitio homeowner's as	lease which dest. When n shall be si ssociation, th	thas a the owner of gned by the be protest
PRINTNAME, Binh Nsa		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	401-6	55-9541
ADDRESS SALVENO DO	CITY CAMPLOON		TATE 'A	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notatized)		<u> </u>	DATE 12	5/10
PRINTNAME VEN DAMA		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408-1	185-9541
ADDRESS SAJerna Dr.	CITY (Amphe	s	TATE C4	ZIPCODE 9500γ
SIGNATURE (Notarized) fruit au (7	•	DATE ⋞∖っ	S) 20
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		7 1
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Noterized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	<u>. </u>	
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE	ZIPÇODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	-		DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	<u>'</u>	
ADDRESS	CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	· 	
ADDRESS	СПУ		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate	sheel if necessary	· · ·		

STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF Sanda Clara Ss.
On Sold 35, 30/D before me, Month Mo
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.
WITNESS my hand and official seal. Commission # 1733376 Notary Public Notary Public Notary Public Notary Public Notary Public Notary Public OiANE M. JAMES Commission # 1733376 Notary Public Seal) OiANE M. JAMES Commission # 1733376 Notary Public Notary Public
STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF Slenda Clara ss.
On 25 200 before me, who proved to me on the basis of satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.

I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing paragraph is true and correct.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

(Seal)

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Prezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Prezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

- 1. <u>Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest</u>. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property 2. Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. <u>Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property.</u> My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEOA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Wabsite: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	TO BE O	MELETED	BY PLANNING STAFF	
FILE NUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	-	DATE
REZONING FILENUMI	BER ·			
			ED BY APPLICANT	100
ADDRESS OF PROPEI PROTESTED		SALE	ENO DR. CARDI	sac (d. 95008
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL	NUMBER(S)	14-02	-047-00	· · · · · ·
REASON OF PROTEST	T sed rezoning because			
	Ua	se separate s	heetiinecessary	
	ich I own an undivided in cribe property by addre		east 51%, and on behalf of whi essor's Parcel Number)	ch this protest is being filed,
				95008
	Parent 414.	-02-0	CAMPBUL, CA.	
and is now zoned	R1-8		_ District. (in Santa Clar	a County)
The undivided inter	est which I own in the pro	operty descri	bed in the statement above is	a:
Feelni	lerest (ownership)			
Leasel	hold interest which expire	es on		
Olher:	(explain)	<u>.</u>		
				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				

SIGNATURE(S), OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filled, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINTNAME / //// Fry		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408 9	139 0689
ADDRESS 1159 SALGRING / DA	CITY	SI	TATE	ZIPCODE SSCUS
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE 9-2	2-2010
PRINTNAME	\	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	rate	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Noterized)		-	DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	នា	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СЛҮ	Ş	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME	".	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	\$	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRES\$	CITY		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate	sheet if necessary	1		

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF <u>SWIA</u> CVMA) ss.)
acknowledged to me that he she she	e, Notary Public, personally appeared who proved to me on the basis of whose name(s) is large subscribed to the within instrument and executed the same in his her/their authorized capacity(ies), and instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the at.
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJU paragraph is true and correct.	CY under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official	M. S. LUCIO Commission # 1796411 Notary Public - California Sania Ctara County My Comm. Explais May 22, 2012 (Seal)
STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) ss.)
satisfactory evidence to be the person(s acknowledged to me that he/she/they o	Notary Public, personally appeared,, Notary Public, personally appeared,, who proved to me on the basis of whose name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and recuted the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and instrument the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the t.
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJU, paragraph is true and correct,	Y under the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and officia	şeal.
	(Seal)

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest — and respectfully urge the City Council to deny — the proposed Director Initiated Prezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Prezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

- 1. <u>Prezoning Payes the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest</u>. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Sania Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	ZON	NG PROTEST APPLICAT	
	=:TO:E	es de l'implement de l'appropriet de la company de la comp	
FILENUMBER		GOUNCIL DISTRICT	DATE
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	BY
REZONINGFILE	NUMBER		
	1/10	HER MOMBRENESSEN APPROAM	Water State of
ea o		(PERSERNINGERINGE)	<u> </u>
ADDRESS OF PR PROTESTED	OPERTY BEING	in . wy	
ASSESSOR'S PA	RCELNUMBER(S) - クユー() ろる	<u> </u>	
REASON OF PRO	<u>ひよっしか</u> jtest		
I protest the 0	roposed rezoning beca	See Attachment A	
1 protoot map			
		Use separate sheet it necessary	u . ttish this protest is being Illed
The property	In which I own an undi	wided interest of at least 51%, and on beha by address and Assessor's Parcel Numb	et) all Ot Mulcut true brotest to going were
,		[A > /	
<u> </u>	4-02-0	32	
<i>l</i> :			
	,		
1	zoned R1-8	District. (in San	ta Clara County)
and is now	zoned <u>R1-8</u>	District. (in San	ta Clara County)
and is now	zoned <u>R1-8</u> ed Interest which Lown	In the property described in the statement	ta Clara County)
and is now The undivide	zoned <u>R1-8</u> ed Interest which I own Fee Interest (ownershi	in the property described in the statement	ta Clara County)
and is now The undivide	ed Interest which i own Fee Interest (ownershi)	in the property described in the statement	ta Clara County)
and is now The undivide	ed Interest which i own Fee Interest (ownershi)	In the property described in the statement	ta Clara County)
and is now The undivide	ed Interest which I own Fee Interest (ownership Leasehold interest wh	In the property described in the statement	ta Clara County)

SIGNATURE(S) (OR PRO TESTANTIS)	
This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of all least 51% which such protest is filled, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under all	in the lot or parcel for ease which has a
remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this pro-	lest. When the owner

which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINT NAME O		DAYTIMĒ TELEPHONE#	409 369.9111
ADDRESS 1046 Frin Way	City	STA	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	(- 1 - 1		DATE 9/27/13
PRINTNAME Janifer for		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	409 410-0336
ADDRESS 1046 Frin W-Y	CAMPBO CAMPBO		4 95025
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE 9/27/10
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHO <u>NE</u> #	,
ADDRESS	CITY	\$TA	ATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	CITY	STA	ATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		DATE
PRINTNAME	·	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	CITY	STA	ATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	CITY		ATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE
Use separate sh	eet if necessary		



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 595-9555 fex (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

FILENUMBER		COUNCIL	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN	DATE
REZONING FILE	NUMBER		
-	η <u>τ</u>) BE COMPLETED BY APPLE (PLEASE PHINT OF TYPE)	
ADDRESS OF PA	ROPERTY BEING		Campbell, CA 9
	RCELNUMBER(S)	01-045	
REASONOFPR	OTEST		
I protest the p	proposed rezoning beca	ause See Attachment A	<u>·</u>
	<u> </u>		
 _		Use separate sheet if necessary	, <u>-</u>
The property	in which I own an undi	Use separate sheet if necessary vided interest of at least 51%, and on	behalf of which this protest is being filed,
is situated at:	(describe property b)	vided interest of at least 51%, and on y address and Assessor's Parcel Nu	behalf of which this protest is being filed, umber)
is situated at:	(describe property b)	vided interest of at least 51%, and on y address and Assessor's Parcel Nu	behalf of which this protest is being filed, umber)
is situated at:	(describe property b)	vided interest of at least 51%, and on y address and Assessor's Parcel Nu	behalf of which this protest is being filed,
is situated at:	(describe property by <u>Erin</u> W <u>Parce I</u> No	vided interest of at least 51%, and on y address and Assessor's Parcel Nu	behalf of which this protest is being filed, umber) CA 95008 - 045
is situated at:	(describe property by Erin W Parce No No No	vided interest of all least 51%, and only address and Assessor's Parcel Ni ay Campbell, amber 414-01	behalf of which this protest is being filed, umber) CA 95008 O45 Santa Clara County)
and is now a	(describe property by Erin W Parce No No No	vided interest of all least 51%, and only address and Assessor's Parcel Number Quantum to be 11, and only address and Assessor's Parcel Number Quantum to be 11, and only address and Assessor's Parcel Number Quantum to be 11, and only address and	behalf of which this protest is being filed, umber) CA 95008 O45 Santa Clara County)
and is now a	(describe property by Erin W Parce No R1-8 dinterest which town in	vided interest of all least 51%, and only address and Assessor's Parcel Number Quantum to be 11, and only address and Assessor's Parcel Number Quantum to be 11, and only address and Assessor's Parcel Number Quantum to be 11, and only address and	behalf of which this protest is being filed, umber) CA 95008 O45 Santa Clara County)
and is now a	(describe property by Let in the property by Parel No. Parel No	vided interest of all least 51%, and only address and Assessor's Parcel Nu ay Campber 7 14 - 07 District. (in Sign the property described in the statem	behalf of which this protest is being filed, umber) CA 95008 - 045 Santa Clara County) nent above is a:



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Sente Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

HIGHINADEO	101	- Secularies	EN PLANNING 5		
TLENUMBER			DISTRICT	DATE	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		DATE	
REZONING FILE NUM	MBER			BY	
	Й	D:BE COMPLE	ED BY APPEC	WT:	
			RINT_OR TYPE)	<u> </u>	10 pt
DORESS OF PROPE ROTESTED SSESSOR'S PARCE	1190 En	i Way			
SSESSORS PARCE	LNUMBER(S)				
414-02 REASON OF PROTES	4 -1720				
		See Attacl	hment A		
I protest the propo	osed rezoning beca	ause <u>See Attacl</u>		<u> </u>	
	_ .				
	.	Lles conorote	sheet il necessary		
The property in w	high Lowe an undir			naif of which this protest is bein	g filed
is situated at: (de	scribe property by	y address and Ass	essor's Parcel Numi	ner)	
1190	Erin Wow	ч		. -	
Cam	obell, C	A 95008			
4/4.	- 02-021	5			
and is now zone				ita Clara County)	
and is now zone	u <u>1(1-0</u>				
The undivided into	erest which I own in	n the property desc	rlbed in the statemen	t above is a:	
Feel	nterest (ownership))			
	ehold Interest whic	ch expires on			
Leas					
_	r: (explain)				

X

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINTNAME Sunita Saxena		DAYTIMË TELEPHONE#	down -val	-837b
	СПҮ	ទា	TATE	ZIPÇODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME Phil. DEUIN wood	•	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS . A S / ~ a .	cry nabel	L C.	TATE (ZIPCODE 95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	1		DATE G/2	7/2010
PRINTNAME		Daytime Telephone#		
ADDRESS	СПҮ	ទា	TATE	ZIPÇODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПУ	Ş	TATE	ZIPÇÖDE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRES\$	СПҮ	S ^r	TATE	ZIPCODE '
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separate sheet i	fnecessary			

county of Senta Clara ;	6S.
on Sept 35, 200 before me, Live 1111 satisfactory evidence-to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/ar acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the same in that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person (s) facted, executed the instrument.	nis/her/their authorized capacity(its), and
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws o paragraph is true and correct.	f the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official seal. Lesse Manuel Notary Public	DIANE M. JAMES Commission # 1733376 Notary Public - California Santa Clara County My Comm. Septem Apr 20, 2011
STATE OF CALIFORNIA) COUNTY OF Santa Clarg)	ss
On 9-27-2010 before me, Michelle Ant Phyllip 14. Er inwood satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(s) is/ar acknowledged to me that he/oke/they executed the same in his that by his/ker/their signature(s) on the instrument the personerson(s) acted, executed the instrument.	, who proved to me on the basis of e-subscribed to the within instrument and is/her/their authorized capacity(ies) , and
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laws of paragraph is true and correct.	the State of California that the foregoing MICHELLE ANTONOWICZ
WITNESS my hand and official seal. The chille autonomics Notary Public	Commission # 1851839 Notary Public - California Sonta Glara County My Comm. Expires Jun 1, 2013 (Seal)

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Prezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Prezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property 2. Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 – an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. <u>Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property</u>. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined turban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. <u>Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements.</u> Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6056 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	TO BE C	OMPLETED	BY PLANNING STAFF	
FILENUMBER			COUNCIL DISTRICT	
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN		BY
REZONING FILE NUM	BER			
-	TO BE		ED BY APPLICANT	- E-1
ADDRESS OF PROPE PROTESTED / 3			POELL 95008	one control of the co
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL			9	
REASON OF PROTES I protest the propose	T sed rezoning because _		•	·
	_ _	Use separate s	heel if necessary	
The property in wh	ich I own an undivided i	interest of at le	ast 51%, and on behalf of whi essor's Parcel Number)	ich this protest is being filed,
			95008_	
-	 			
and is now zoned	R1-8		District. (in Santa Clar	a County)
The undivided inte	rest which I own in the p	property descri	ibed in the statement above is	a:
₩ Feeln	terest (ownership)			
Lease	shold interest which exp	olres on		
Olher	:(explain)			
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRHYNAME PEPLIN		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	150-7	40-6305
ADDRESS /	CAMPBOUL	sj	ATE	ZIPCODE 75008
1200 EPAN AVAT	CAMPBOU		<u>/-(</u>	15008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			19 22	-10
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	ĊĪŢŶ		TATE	Z(PCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	···		DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRES\$	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СЛҮ	s	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME	·	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separa	le sheet if necessar	<i>y</i>		

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF Santa Claia)
satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose acknowledged to me that he/she/they execute	who proved to me on the basis of the name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and ment the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY und paragraph is true and correct.	der the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official seal. Lune M Jan Notary Public	DIANE M. JAMES Commission # 1733376 Notary Public - Californic Santa Clara County My Comm. Explain Apr 20, 201
STATE OF CALIFORNIA) ss
acknowled.ged to me that he/she/they execute that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instru	Notary Public, personally appeared, who proved to me on the basis of e name(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and d the same in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and ment the person(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
person(s) acted, executed the instrument. I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY und paragraph is true and correct,	ler the laws of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official seal.	
Notary Public	(Seal)

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest — and respectfully urge the City Council to deny — the proposed Director Initiated Prezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Prezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to -- the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property 2. Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. <u>Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property.</u> My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. <u>Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements</u>. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-5055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

	1	O BE COMP	LETED:BY.P	EANNING	STAFF		
FILE NUMBER	Tronnia "		COUN			DATE	
QUAD#	ZONING		ENERAL AN				
REZÖNING FILE NU	MBER	<u>'</u>		••		BY	
			MPLETED B		ANT.		
ADDRESS OF PROP	COTYPEINO		EASEIPHINISOI	alender on brandisk e			<u></u>
PROTESTED	1206 8	RIN WAY	1 CAMP	BEZL	CA S	P5008-6	6104
ASSESSOR'S PARCE	ELNUMBER(S)	11407	-018				
REASONOFPROTE	ST		- V				
I protest the prop	oséd rezoning b	ecause See	Attachment	<u> </u>	•	<u>.</u>	
		Usesa	eparale sheet if r	ecessary			_
The property in w	hich I own an u	ndivided intere	st of at least 51%	6, and on b	ehalf of wi	hich this prote	st is being filed,
/206	ecina propanj ERIN	way.	CAMP	BELL	CA.	95008	-6104
# 414	02018						
							
and is now zone	d <u>R1-8</u>		Dist	rict. (in Sa	nta Cla	ra County)	•
The undivided int	erest which I ow	n in the proper	rty described in t	the stateme	nt above	ls a:	
🔀 Feel	nterest (owners)	hip)					
Leas	ehold interest v	vhich expires o	on	_			
Othe	r:(explain) _						··
						<u> </u>	
							_

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest sife is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in fieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

							,, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
PRINTNAME DOJGLAS	GEORG	SE BI	LLING	stuV_	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408 3	508828
ADDRESS 1206 4	FRIN	WHY,	, QAN	NOBEL	L CA	TATE 9	21P CODE 1008 6/64
SIGNATURE (Noterized)	Long	BiN	stu	`		DATE 9	1-22-10
PRINTNAME		/		·	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS				СЦА	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		_				DATE	
PRINTNAME	•	·			DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS			•	CITY	S1	TATE	ZIPÇÕDE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)						DATE	
PRINTNAME					DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS				CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)					,	DATE	
PRINTNAME		·			DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS				ÇITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)						DATE	
PRINTNAME					DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS				СПҮ		TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)						DATE	
		Usesep	arate sheet	if necessary	, <u> </u>		

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)	
COUNTY OF LANG CLAM) в	
satistactory evidence to be the perso acknowledged to me that he/she/the	on(s) whose name(s) by executed the sam the instrument the	are الطفارة). e in chi s	Notary Public, personally appeared, who proved to me on the basis of subscribed to the within instrument and [5]her/iheir authorized capacity(ies), and n(s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PENALTY OF PER paragraph is true and correct.	JURY under the la	ws of t	the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and offi	cial seal.		M. S. LUCIO Commission # 1796411 Notary Public - California \$ ania Clara County My Comm. Exples May 22, 2012 (Seal)
STATE OF CALIFORNIA)) 65	ss.
COUNTY OF)	
On before			, Notary Public, personally appeared, who proved to me on the basis of
cknowledged to me that he/she/the	y executed the same the instrument the p	in his/	subscribed to the within instrument and s/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and (s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJ paragraph is true and correct.	URY under the law	ws of th	the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and offic	ial seal.		
<u> </u>			(Seal)
Notary Public			/y

service. As such, the City's intended annexation would not qualify for a streamlined urban island annexation pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3 because it does not meet the criteria set forth in Government Code § 56375.3(b)(6).

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEOA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6056 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

LENUMBER		D	OUNCIL ISTRICT		DATE	
ŲAD#	ZÖNING	GENERAL PLAN	·		BY	
EZONINGFILEN	NUMBER					
	Ji)	Pinalan Michael afaite Angalan arang	orov (Krist orov (Krist)	IO/A(NI)		
DDRESSOFPR		O SALERI	Contraction of the Contraction o		mPBe11	95
ROTESTED SSESSOR'S PAR	RCELNUMBER(S)	o synchol	<u>к. С. — «</u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
		50				
EASON OF PRO	n Eð í Innheád æranlað hað	ause See Attachm	ien <u>t</u> A			
i brotest ine bi	rohosed (esoveið nec					
_						
		Use separate sha				
		vided interest of at leas	si 51%, and or sor's Parcel N	n behall of wh Vumber)		ls being f
		vided interest of at leas	si 51%, and or sor's Parcel N	n behall of wh Vumber)		s being f
is situated at:	(describe property b O SALERNO	ivided interest of at leasi by address and Assess DR LA	si 51%, and or sor's Parcel M mPBell	n behall of wh Number) 1 , <u>C</u> A	95008	
is situated at:	(describe property b O SALERNO	vided interest of at leas	si 51%, and or sor's Parcel M mPBell	n behall of wh Number) 1 , <u>C</u> A	95008	
is situated at:	(describe property to O <u>SALERNO</u> CCE/ <u>F+ 4/4</u>	lvided interest of at lease by address and Assess DR LAI -05-641-6	sl 51%, and or sor's Parcel M MPBC/, OO	n behall of wi Number) 1 CA	95008	
is situated at:	(describe property b O SALERNO RCE/ FF 4/4 coned R1-8	lvided interest of at lease by address and Assess DR LAT -05-641-	si 51%, and or sor's Parce! M M P B C I, O O District. (in	n behalf of wh Number) 1 CA	95008 ura County)	
is situated at:	(describe property b O SALERNO RCE/ FF 4/4 coned R1-8	lvided interest of at lease by address and Assess DR LAI -05-641-6	si 51%, and or sor's Parce! M M P B C I, O O District. (in	n behalf of wh Number) 1 CA	95008 ura County)	
is situated at: PAN and Is now z	(describe property b O SALERNO RCE/ FF 4/4 coned R1-8	lvided interest of at lease by address and Assess DR LAI -OS-O41-0 In the property describe	si 51%, and or sor's Parce! M M P B C I, O O District. (in	n behalf of wh Number) 1 CA	95008 ura County)	
is situated at: PAN and is now z The undivided	(describe property by CO SALERNO) CCC F4 H/4 coned R1-8 d interest which I own	lvided interest of at lease by address and Assess DR LAI -OS-O41-0 In the property describe	si 51%, and or sor's Parce! A MPBC!, O O District. (in	n behalf of wh Number) 1 CA	95008 ura County)	
is situated at:	(describe property by SALERNO) CCE / F+ F+/4 coned R1-8 d interest which I own Fee Interest (ownership Leasehold interest wh	lvided interest of at lease by address and Assess DR LAI -OS-O41-0 In the property describe	sl 51%, and or sor's Parcel MMPBell, OO Destrict. (in pad in the state	n behall of wh Number) / Santa Cla ement above	95008 ara County)	

X

€₽	9200 <u>55608</u> 08	90 - 30 July - 30	no en sus		
			(¥) (TO CONTRACT OF THE	STANT(S)
-31	es ranga	LIBERTS	18091784	3 T 1 3 B B EA	THE PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF TH
~.			786.3 11 688.3	and the later of the same of	and the second second second second

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINTHAME TO RUCH		TELEPHONE#		2-0709	
10. Box 31010	Sos Satos	(%) (%)	ATE	ZIPCODE 95031	
SIGNATURE (Notarizod) Ruch			DATE / 27	7/10	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#			
ADDRESS	СПУ	S	IATE	ZIPCODE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE		
PRINTNAME	<u> </u>	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#			
ADDRESS	CITY	នា	TATE	ZIPCODE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE		
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#			
ADDRESS	СПҮ	Ş	TATE	ZIPCODE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE		
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#			
ADDRESS	СПУ	S	TATE	ZIPCODE	
SIGNATURE (Noterized)			DATE		
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#			
ADDRESS	СПҮ	8	TATE	ZIPCODE	
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE		
Use separate sheet if necessary					

STATE OF CALIFORNIA	A)	
COUNTY OF 4404	CLMA) ss.)	
satisfactory evidence-to l acknowledged to me tha	be the person(s) whose r t he/she/they executed to ature(s) on the instrume	name(s) is/are s the same in his/l	, Notary Public, personally appeared who proved to me on the basis of ubscribed to the within instrument and her/their authorized capacity(ies), and s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PENAL: paragraph is true and co		r the laws of th	ne State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my la	and and official seal.		M. S. LUCIO Commission # 1796411 Notary Public - California \$ Santa Clara County MyComm. Poples May 22, 2012 (Seal)
STATE OF CALIFORNIA	A)) ss	
COUNTY OF		,	•
acknowledged to me tha	be the person(s) whose in the/she/they executed in the instrument in the instrument.	name(s) is/are s the same in his/	Notary Public, personally appeared who proved to me on the basis of ubscribed to the within instrument and her/their authorized capacity(ies), and s), or the entity upon behalf of which the
I certify under PBNAL paragraph is true and co		r the laws of ti	he State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my h	and and official seal.		
Notary	Public		(Seal)

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

I protest -- and respectfully urge the City Council to deny -- the proposed Director Initiated Prezoning (File No. C10-010) ("Prezoning") that would result in the rezoning of my property to R-1-5 Single-Family Residence Zoning District upon annexation to the City of San Jose for the following reasons and with reference to the following facts:

- 1. <u>Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest</u>. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- 2. Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property
 Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City
 of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of
 both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into
 the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property
 owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of
 Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different
 possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from
 City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy
 (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both
 Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains
 unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San
 Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36
 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with
 Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. <u>Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property.</u> My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

	10	BEICOMBUSIE	DEST PRANNING	STARR		
FILE NUMBER	ZONING	GENERAL	COUNCIL DISTRICT		DATE	
·		PLAN			BY	
REZONING FILE	NUMBER .				<u></u>	
	i i	eastateaning	ALEGA PARTICIO	ANT		
		A SECURITION OF THE PROPERTY O	ORINI OR TVICE)			<u> </u>
ADDRESS OF PROPESTED	OPERTY BEING	187 Sal	erno Dr	Can	rabell Co	à
ASSESSOR'S PAR	RCELNUMBER(S)	414-02	erno Dr. - 049		<i>U</i>	
	T					
REASON OF PHO	исот					
REASON OF PRO	vonosád rezonina ha	cause See Attac	chment A	<u>.</u>		_ _
1 protest the pr	roposéd rezoning be	_{сацве_} See_Attac	chment A	<u>.</u>		·
protest the pr	roposéd rezoning be	See Attac	chment A	<u> </u>		_ _ . ·
Protest the pr	raposed rezoning be					
I protest the pr	roposed rezoning be	Use separat divided interest of a	e sheet if necessary	ohali ot wh	nich this prolest is	s being liled
I protest the pr	roposed rezoning be	Use separat divided interest of a	e sheet if necessary	ohali ot wh	nich this prolest is	s being liled
I protest the pr	roposed rezoning be	Use separat divided interest of a	e sheet if necessary	ohali ot wh	nich this prolest is	s being liled
I protest the pr	roposed rezoning be	Use separat divided interest of a	t least 51%, and on b	ohali ot wh	nich this prolest is	s being liled
I protest the pr	in which town en und (describe property Alexa (Use separated by address and As	e sheet if necessary	oehalf of wi mber)	nich this protest is	s being liled
The property is situated at:	in which I own en und (describe property 414-	Use separated wide divided interest of a by address and As	e sheet if necessary it least 51%, and on to sepssor's Parcel Nur gell (3)	pehalf of wi mber) lanta Cla	nich this protest is	s being liled
The property is situated at:	in which I own en und (describe property 414-	Use separated by address and Associated for the property decided interest of a separate for the property decided for the	e sheet if necessary It least 51%, and on to seessor's Parcel Nu. The Control of the Control District. (in S	pehalf of wi mber) lanta Cla	nich this protest is	s being liled
The property is situated at:	in which town en und (describe property 4/4- oned R1-8	Use separated by address and As Dr. Grange - 02 - 04 9	t least 51%, and on bespessor's Parcel Number of Car. District. (in Secribed in the statements)	pehalf of wi mber) lanta Cla	nich this protest is	s being liled
The property is situated at: ### And Is now z The undivided	reposed rezoning be in which I own en und (describe property 4/4- coned R1-8 d Interest which I own each old interest which I own each old interest with the contract of the contract with the contract of the	Use separated livided interest of a by address and As by address a	t least 51%, and on bespessor's Parcel Number of Car. District. (in Secribed in the statements)	pehalf of whether) Santa Cla	nich this prolest is ara County) Is a:	s being liled

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filled, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entitly other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereol, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINTNAME		DAYTIME	
Russell James	Maynard	TELEPHONE#	408-839-1952
ADDRESS /187 Saterno	Ayre Campb.	.// \$F	ATE ZIP CODE 2. 95008
SIGNATURE (Noterized)	1		DATE 9-27-10
PRINTNAME /	/	Daytime Telephone#	
ADDRESS	CXTY	ST	ATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	CITY	şı	ATE ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	СПУ	Si	ATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	CITY	នា	TATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		DATE
PRINTNAME	•••	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	СПУ	S	TATE ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)	·		DATE
	Use separate sheet if necessary		

X

STATE OF CALIFO)	SS.	
COUNTY OF	MA CLAMA	ý		
acknowledged to n that by his/her/thei	ce to be the person(s) whose he that he/she/they executed	name(s) is/a the same in	, Notary Public, persona , who proved to me on the l re subscribed to the within instru his/her/their authorized capacity on(s), or the entity upon behalf o	ment and (les), and
		er the laws o	of the State of California that th	e foregoing
paragraph is true a WITNESS:	my hand and official seal. Mary Public		M. S. LUCK Commission # 17 Notary Public - Cr Sania Clara Cr My Comm. Exples Ma (Seal)	796411 allitornia punty
STATE OF CALIFO	DRNIA)	SS.	
COUNTY OF)		
Onsatisfactory eviden	before me, ce-to be the person(s) whose	name(s) is/a	, Notary Public, persons , who proved to me on the are subscribed to the within instra his/her/their authorized capacity	basis of iment and
that by his/her/thei	ir signature(s) on the instrument.	ent the pers	son(s), or the entity upon behalf o	f which the
I certify under PE paragraph is true a		er the laws	of the State of California that th	e foregoing
WITNESS	my hand and official seal.			
			(Seal)	
No	otary Public			

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property 2. Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 -- more than 16 years ago -- and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

COUNCIL DISTRICT QUAD# ZONING GENERAL PLAN REZONING FILE NUMBER TO BE COMRESTED BY ARREICANT (REASEPHINJORTYPE) ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED BY STORE HEST WAY Compress On ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) 4/2-40-026 REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number) This property is situated at 854 Standard 2508 The Brown on Tarrel Number is 412-7	
QUAD# ZONING GENERAL PLAN REZONING FILE NUMBER TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT: (NUEASE PRINT OR TYPE) ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED BY Store Host way Compete In. ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) 4/2 - 40 - C2G REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)	BY
PLAN REZONING FILE NUMBER TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT (NUFASE PRINT OR TYPE) ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED BY Store Hips way Complete In. ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) 4/2 - 40 - 07.6 REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)	75008
ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED 84 Store Hops 1 way Compact In. ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) 4/2-40-026 REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)	75008
ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED & State Hunst wary Complete On. ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) 4/2-40-026 REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)	
ADDRESS OF PROPERTY BEING PROTESTED & Store Hossy way Complete In. ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) 4/2-40-026 REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)	
PROTESTED 654 Store Hips Wary Complete In. ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) 4/2-40-OZG REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)	
ASSESSOR'S PARCEL NUMBER(S) 4/2-40-026 REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)	
A/2 - 40 - CZG REASONOF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)	
REASON OF PROTEST I protest the proposed rezoning because See Attachment A Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)	
Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)	
Use separate sheet if necessary The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)	
The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)	
The property in which I own an undivided interest of at least 51%, and on behalf of is situated at: (describe property by address and Assessor's Parcel Number)	
This property to situated at 254 Stonehure	which this protest is being filed,
9508 The December of Muster in 412. 7	March 1 all 1.
9-408 -11. D Special Marches 12 412 9	t was complete ca
CANO PALENTAL PARENTE PROPERTY AND THE	6- 626
	<u>.</u> .
and is now zoned R1-8 District. (in Santa C	lara County)
The undivided interest which I own In the property described in the statement above	/e is a:
Fee Interest (ownership)	
Leasehold Interest which expires on	
Other: (explain)	

er i	e sa			2005 A 100 A	44.00 St 201	A 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	NT(S)
ZKI	an m	COLUMN TO SERVICE	3127C)	160 A 1 E 18	רחסס		MITHELL
25 I	LEINE	A II U I	10 J	2012/17/2022		B = 3 - 2 - 7	

This form must be signed by **ONE** or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

ADDRESS SSY STONE FLORET WAY SIGNATURE (NOWETZER)		Daytime T <u>eleph</u> one#		71-3798
ADDRESS	CITY	ST	ATE	ZIPCODE
854 STONE ALRST WAY	CAMPBELL			<u>95008</u>
SIGNATIONE (Noterizadi)			DATE <i>9_</i>	125/10
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СЛУ	ST	ATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	ST	ATE	ZIP CODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	•	
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПҮ	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	СПУ	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
Use separa	te sheet if necessary			

STATE OF CALIFOR	INIA)		
COUNTY OF $S_{\!\!\!\!2}$	nda Clava) ss.)		
acknowledged to me	before me, when we have not the person(s) whose nor that he/she/they executed the signature (s) on the instrument uted the instrument.	me(§) is/ are sub: same in his/her	/their authorized cap	the basis of natrument and acity(leg), and
I certify under PEN. paragraph is true and	ALTY OF FERJURY under t d correct.	he laws of the	State of California th	at the foregoing
Dian	y hand and official seal. Note that the seal of the s	ر ا	(Seal)	DIANE M. JAMES Committeion # 1733376 Notary Public - Californic Santa Clara County My Comm. Equits Apr 20, 2011
STATE OF CALIFOR	AIM)) ss.)		
acknowledged to me	to be the person(s) whose nar that he/she/they executed the signature(s) on the instrument	ne(s) is/are subs same in his/her	their authorized cap-	the basis of nstrument and acity(ies), and
I certify under PEN. paragraph is true and	ALTY OF PERJURY under the correct.	he laws of the	State of California th	at the foregoing
WITNESS my	y hand and official seal.			
Nota	ry Public		(Seal)	

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEOA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Wabsite: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

FILENUMBER	C10-010		COUNCIL DISTRICT		DATE
QUAD#	ZONING	GENERAL PLAN			BY
REZONING FILE	NUMBER				
	Į.	OPER COMPLEX	TEO:BY-APPL	ICANT.	
				_	
PROTESTED ASSESSOR'S PA	ARCELNUMBER(S)		•	<u>,ι «ννφΩ</u> ι	ell CA 95008
		412-3	9-042		
REASONOFPR	OTEST	Can Alfrai	hment A		
I project the r	proposéd rezoning bed	cause See Attacl	шисит <u>А</u>	<u>.</u>	
i hi orași iiia h					
- hiorest ind h		<u> </u>			
- Promor ma					
		Use separate	sheetifnecessary		
The property	rin which I own an und	Use separate Itvided interest of at I by address and Ass	sheetifnecessary least 51%, and on sessor's Parcel N	y hehalf of w	hich this protest is being fi
The property	rin which I own an und	Use separate Itvided interest of at I by address and Ass	sheetifnecessary least 51%, and on sessor's Parcel N	y hehalf of w	hich this protest is being fi
The property is situated at	in which I own an und : (describe property i only of 956	Use separate fivided interest of at t by address and Ass 5 Salervo DV	sheetifnecessary least 51%, and on sessor's Parcel N	y behalf of w lumber)	hich this protest is being fi
The property is situated at	in which I own an und : (describe property i only of 956	Use separate fivided interest of at t by address and Ass 5 Salervo DV	sheetifnecessary least 51%, and on sessor's Parcel N	y behalf of w lumber)	hich this protest is being fi
The property is situated at the property of th	in which I own an und : (describe property i only of 956	Use separate fivided interest of at 1 by address and Ass 5 Salerva Dy	sheetifnecessary least 51%, and on essor's Parcel N Live Comp	behalf of w lumber)	thich this protest is being fi 4-95008
The property is situated at the property of th	rin which I own an und : (describe property i entry at 955 (Nowaber * zoned R1-8	Use separate itvided interest of at 1 by address and Ass 5 Salervo Dy 112 -39-04	sheet if necessary least 51%, and on lessor's Parcel N Live Comp 2	Santa Cla	which this protest is being to 4-95008 ara County)
The property is situated at The property of Time and is now.	in which I own an und : (describe property i enty at 955 (Nowher *	Use separate It vided interest of at 1 by address and Ass 5 Salervo DY 112 -39 - 047 In the property description	sheet if necessary least 51%, and on lessor's Parcel N Live Comp 2	Santa Cla	which this protest is being to 4-95008 ara County)
The property is situated at The Property of Toe	rin which I own an und : (describe property if enty of 956 (Nowher 4 zoned R1-8 ed interest which I own	Use separate itvided interest of at 1 by address and Ass 5 Salerwo DY 112 -39 - 047 in the property descip)	sheet if necessary least 51%, and on sessor's Parcel N Live Comp District. (in	Santa Cla	which this protest is being to 4-95008 ara County)
The property is situated at The Property of The Tree and is now.	rin which I own an und : (describe property in the describe of 956 (Nowher ** zoned R1-8	Use separate itvided interest of at 1 by address and Ass 5 Salerwo DY 112 -39 - 047 in the property descrip) nich expires on	sheet if necessary least 51%, and on sessor's Parcel N Live Comp District. (in	Santa Cla	which this protest is being to 4-95008 ara County)

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

Zoning Protest pm65/AppRation Rev. 6/2/2008

X

SIGNATUREIS) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

PRINTNAME STEVEN MARK MOOR		DAYTIME TELEPHONE# 40	8 969-9680
ADDRESS 955 Salerno Dr	Campbell	STATE CA-	95008
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DAT	F9-28-2010
PRINTNAME	_	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
AODRES\$	CITY	STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DAT	TE .
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	СЛҮ	STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DAT	TE
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	CITY	STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DAT	匿 -
PRINTNAME	·-	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	-
ADDRESS	CLLA	STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DAT	TE
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	
ADDRESS	СПУ	STATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		DA	TE
Usesepar	ale sheet if necessary		

STATE OF CALIFORNIA) ss.
COUNTY OF SANTA CLARA)
On 27 SEPTEM BER—before me, WILLAM BER—before me, WILLAM BER—before me, WILLAM STEVEN MARK MOGRE—satisfactory evidence-to be the person(s) whose name acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the sathat by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.	(s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and me in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the paragraph is true and correct.	laws of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official seal. William J Barrings Notary Public	WILLIAM F. BRONNER COMM. # 1697638 COMM. # 1697638 MOJANY PUBLIC CALIFORNIA STATE CLARA COUNTY MY COUNT EAR HOY. 1, 2010 (Seal)
STATE OF CALIFORNIA) ss.
onbefore me, satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the sa that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.	, who proved to me on the basis of (s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and me in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the paragraph is true and correct.	laws of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official seal,	•
Notary Public	(Seal)

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. <u>Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest</u>. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with -- and is a necessary prerequisite to -- the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property 2. Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. <u>Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property.</u> My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEOA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-3555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- CO	vino-marchina more anno	THE PROPERTY OF STREET PROPERTY AND ADDRESS OF THE PARTY.							ACC. 10 THE REST OF THE REST O	100 - 107 JOHN
			522042400000000	OMPLETE	D:BY PLAN		rafir-			14.00
FIL	ENUMBER \subset	10-0	10		COUNCIL DISTRICT	_				
	AD#	ZONING	, _ .	GENERA				DATE .		
•••				PLAN				BY		
RE:	ZONINGFILEN	JMBER								
_									n en	
			TOBE	COMPLE	TEO BY A	PPLICA	NT			
				記録書作の数本を対象 で	RINT <u>o</u> lity	Manager Christian	(E) (S)			20.44
	DRESS OF PAC OTESTED	PERTYBEING 11	8 SALE	PANO	Do Ca	MPB	eu (1A 9.	5008	
	SESSOR'S PARC	ELNUMBER	(S)							
			<u>ે પાય</u> .	-05-0	144					
	ASONOFPROT									
	Lorgiest the pro	posed rezonl	no heceuse	See Attac	:hment A		•			
	· braisar mit br-		18 w+++-++		-					
							_	_		
								_		
				<u>-</u>	sheet if nece	essary				
	The property in	which Lown 6	l undivided	Use separate	sheet if nece	nd on beha	alf of whi	ch this pr	otest is be	ng filed
	The property in is situated at: (c	which I own a	n undivided l	Use separate Interest of al ress and As	e sheet if nece t least 51%, a sessor's Par	nd on behi cel Numb	67)		rotest is be	ng filed
	The property in is situated at: fo	which I own a tescribe prop ALE(2.N	n undivided l perty by eddi ODIZLU	Use separate Interest of al ress and As	e sheet if nece t least 51%, a sessor's Par	nd on behi cel Numb	67)		rotest is be	ng filed
	The property in is situated at: fo	which I own a	n undivided l perty by eddi ODIZLU	Use separate Interest of al ress and As	e sheet if nece t least 51%, a sessor's Par	nd on behi cel Numb	67)		rotest is be	ng filed
	The property in is situated at: (c	which I own a lescribe prop BALE(C.N.	n undivided l perty by eddi OTMU	Use separate Interest of all ress and As £, (A)	e sheet if nece tleast 51%, a sessor's Par UPBELL	nd on beha cel Numb	ei) 9 <i>50</i>	08		ng filed
	The property in is situated at: fo	which I own a lescribe prop BALE(C.N.	n undivided l perty by eddi OTMU	Use separate Interest of all ress and As £, (A)	e sheet if nece t least 51%, a sessor's Par	nd on beha cel Numb	ei) 9 <i>50</i>	08		ng filed
	The property in is situated at: (c	which I own a lescribe prop ALE(2.N [14-05- ned <u>R1-8</u>	on undivided to berty by adds	Use separate Interest of al ress and As £, (A)	e sheet if nece tleast 51%, a sessor's Par LAPECL	nd on behi cel Numb (A)	er) G <u>SO</u> - ta Clar	08_ a Coun		ng filed
	The property in is situated at: (c) 1 108 5	which I own a lescribe prop ALE(2.N (14-05- ned RI-8	n undivided to berty by addition of the community of the	Use separate Interest of al ress and As £, (A)	e sheet if nece tleast 51%, a sessor's Par LAPECL	nd on behi cel Numb (A)	er) G <u>SO</u> - ta Clar	08_ a Coun		ng filed
	The property in is situated at: (c) 1 108 5	which I own a lescribe prop ALE(2.N [14-05- ned <u>R1-8</u>	n undivided to berty by addition of the control of	Use separate Interest of al ress and As £, (A)	e sheet if nece tleast 51%, a sessor's Par LAPECL	nd on behi cel Numb (A)	er) G <u>SO</u> - ta Clar	08_ a Coun		ng filed
	The property in is situated at: (c) 1 t 08 \(\) and is now zoo The undivided i	which I own a lescribe prop ALE(2.N (14-05- ned RI-8	n undivided berty by addi O Druu O44 Lown In the p	Use separate interest of all ress and As E, CA V	e sheet if necest fleast 51%, a sessor's Par LAPISCUL District.	nd on beha cel Numb (A) (in San)	er) G <u>SO</u> - ta Clar	08_ a Coun		ng filed
	The property in is situated at: (a 1 t 0 8 \$ 2 \$ 2 \$ 2 \$ 2 \$ 2 \$ 2 \$ 2 \$ 2 \$ 2 \$	which I own a lescribe property in the lescribe property in the lescribe property in the lescribe which a interest (own a linterest (own a lin	n undivided berty by addi O Draw O 44 Lown In the parentip)	Use separate Interest of all ress and As E, A	b sheet if necest teast 51%, a sessor's Par LAPISCUL District.	nd on beha cel Numb (A) (in San) statement	er) G S O . ta Clar above is	08_ a Coun		ng filed

PLEASE CALL THE APPOINTMENT DESK AT (408) 535-3555 FOR AN APPLICATION APPOINTMENT.

Zaráng Protect prv65/App6cetion, Rev. 6/2/2008

SIGNATURE(S): OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of at least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is filed, such interest being not merely an essement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

		400		
PRINTNAME CANDACE DE COU		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	408-3	71-1112
ADDRESS 1108 SALERNO DZIVE, CAMP	RELL CITY	<u> </u>	TATE	ZIPCODE 5008
SIGNATURE (Noterized) (Audition De Cu.			DATE q/:	25/2010
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	<u> </u>	TATE.	ŽIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINT NAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	<u> </u>	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	ÇITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)		<u> </u>	DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	!	
ADDRESS	ÇITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Notarized)			DATE	
PRINTNAME		DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
ADDRESS	CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
SIGNATURE (Noterized)		_	DATE	
Use separate shee	t il necessar	у	·	

STATE OF CALL	FORNIA)) 65.		•
COUNTY OF 2	Santa Wara)		
satisfactory evide acknowledged to that by his/her/th	before me, Neck percented the person (s) whose name that he/she/they executed the person (s) whose name is signature(s) on the instrument.	بر <u>()</u> بر nme(s) is/are subsc e same in his/her/i	the proved to n ribed to the wit their authorized	thin instrument and I capacity(ies), and
I certify under I paragraph is true	PENALTY OF PERJURY under to earld correct.	the laws of the St	tate of Californ	ia that the foregoing
D	S my hand and official seal. (int) Manual Notary Public	/	(Seal)	DIANE M. JAMES Commission ≢ 1733376 Notary Public - Californic Sania Clara County My Comm. Explos Apr 20, 2011
STATE OF CALI	FORNIA)) ss.		
COUNTY OF		.)		•
acknowledged to	ence-to be the person(s) whose na i me that he/she/they executed the teir signature(s) on the instrumen	me(s) is/are subsc e same in his/her/i	tho proved to n ribed to the wit heir authorized	l capacity(ies), and
-	executed the instrument.	[(-),	,,	
I certify under I paragraph is true	PENALTY OF PERJURY under to and correct.	the laws of the St	ate of Californ	ia that the foregoing
WITNES	S my hand and official seal.			
			(Seal)	
Ĭ.	Notary Public			

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property 2. Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 – an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. <u>Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property.</u> My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEOA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).



Planning, Building and Code Enforcement 200 East Santa Clara Street San José, CA 95113-1905 tel (408) 535-9555 fax (408) 292-6055 Website: www.sanjoseca.gov/planning

ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

	1(0)	er sowehered	HY PLANN	NG STAFF		<u> </u>
FILENUMBER	***** <u>****</u> **		COUNCIL			
QUAD#	ZÖNİNG	GENERAL			DATE	
·		PLAN			_ ву	
REZONING FILENU	JMBER				<u></u>	
	- 1	ioere combre	IEDIBY AR	PEREVANIE		
		All the second s	FINE ORTYPI			
ADDRESS OF PROF PROTESTED	PERTYBEING	501 D	A/IAS_	DRIVE	<u>, САМРВЕ</u>	<u> LL(A9</u>
ASSESSOR'S PARC	ELNUMBER(S)	_				
REASONOFPROTE	EST		·			
I protect the prot	nacéd rezonina her	ceuse See Attach	hment A	<u></u>		·
i protest the prop	poséd rezoning ber	cause See Attacl	hment A_	<u> </u>		· <u>-</u> .
i protest the prop	poséd rezoning bei	CRUSE See Attach	hment A	<u>-</u>		
I protest the prot	poséd rezoning ber					
The average line	ushigh Lown on 1106	Use separate	sheetil necess	ary on behall of w		
The property in v	which I own an und	Use separate	sheetil necess	ary on behall of w	hich this protes	
The property in v	which I own an und	Use separate	sheetil necess	ary on behall of w	hich this protes	
The property in v	which I own an und lescribe property	Use separate	sheetil necess leasi 51%, and lessor's Parce C. AM PB	ary on behall of w Number) FLL, (A	hich this protes	ì is being filter
The property in v	which I own an und lescribe property	Use separate divided interest of at I by address and Ass DRIVE	sheetil necess leasi 51%, and lessor's Parce C. AM PB	ary on behall of w Number) FLL, (A	thich this protes	ì is being filter
The property in v	which I own an und lescribe property DA/IAS HIG	Use separate divided interest of at I by address and Ass DRIVE	sheetil necess least 51%, and lessor's Parce (AMPBa	ary on behall of w Number) FLL, CA	nhich this protes	it is being (ite
The property invites situated at: (d)	which I own an unclescribe property: DA/IAS	Use separate divided interest of at I by address and Ass DRIVE	sheet if necess least 51%, and lessor's Parce (AMPBa	ary on behalf of w Number) FLL (A in Santa Cl	hich this protes 9570019 ara County)	it is being (ite
The property in vis situated at: (d 50) and is now zon The undivided in	which I own an unclascribe property DA/IAS HIGH	Use separate divided interest of at interest of at interest and Ass DRIVE 2 -31-006 In the property description	sheet if necess least 51%, and lessor's Parce (AMPBa	ary on behalf of w Number) FLL (A in Santa Cl	hich this protes 9570019 ara County)	it is being (ite
The property invise situated at: (d 50) and is now zon The undivided in	which I own an und lescribe property in the le	Use separate divided interest of at liby address and Ass DRIVE D31-006	sheet if necess least 51%, and lessor's Parce (AMPBa) District. (ary on behalf of w Number) FLL (A in Santa Cl	hich this protes 9570019 ara County)	it is being (ite
The property in vis situated at: (d 50) and is now zon The undivided in	which I own an und lescribe property DA/IAS	Use separate divided interest of at I by address and Ass DRIVE 2 -31 - 006 at II in the property description in the expires on	sheet if necess least 51%, and ressor's Parce CAMPBa District. (on behalf of wall with the second sec	which this protes	it is being (ite
The property in vis situated at: (d 50) and is now zon The undivided in	which I own an und lescribe property DA/IAS	Use separate divided interest of at liby address and Ass DRIVE D31-006	sheet if necess least 51%, and ressor's Parce CAMPBa District. (on behalf of wall with the second sec	which this protes	it is being (ite

X

SIGNATURE(S) OF PROTESTANT(S)

This form must be signed by ONE or more owners of an undivided interest of all least 51% in the lot or parcel for which such protest is tiled, such interest being not merely an easement. A tenant under a lease which has a remaining term of ten years or longer shall be deemed an "owner" for purposes of this protest. When the owner of an eligible protest site is a legal entity other than a person or persons, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such legal entity. When such legal entity is a homeowner's association, the protest petition shall be signed by the duly authorized officer(s) of such association, or, in lieu thereof, by 51% of the members of the association.

	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	40837	
CITY CAMPBE	u Ö	TATE	ŹIPCODE 9500P
inv		DATE 9	27:2010
	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
CiTY	\$	TATE	ZIPCODE
	• •	DATE	
	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		·
ÇITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
		DATE	
	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	:	
CITY	S	TATE	ZIPCODE
		DATE	
	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#		
CITY	Š	TATE	ZIPCODE
		DATE	·
	DAYTIME TELEPHONE#	,	
CITY			ZIPCODE
·		DATE	
sheet If necessary	,		
	CITY	DAYTIME TELEPHONE# CITY DAYTIME TELEPHONE# CITY DAYTIME TELEPHONE# CITY DAYTIME TELEPHONE# CITY DAYTIME TELEPHONE# TELEPHONE# CITY DAYTIME TELEPHONE# TELEPHONE#	TELEPHONE # 37 CITY STATE DAYTIME TELEPHONE # CITY STATE DATE

STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
COUNTY OF GANDA CLAMA) ss.)
on 121(10 before me, 19, Will satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the sat that by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.	s) is/are subscribed to the within instrument and me in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the laparagraph is true and correct.	M. S. LUCIO Commission # 1796411 Notary Public - California Santa Clara County
WITNESS my hand and official seal.	My Comm. Expires May 22, 2012
Notary Public	(Seal)
STATE OF CALIFORNIA COUNTY OF)) es.)
On before me,	, Notary Public, personally appeared , who proved to me on the basis of
satisfactory evidence to be the person(s) whose name(acknowledged to me that he/she/they executed the satthat by his/her/their signature(s) on the instrument the person(s) acted, executed the instrument.	me in his/her/their authorized capacity(ies), and
I certify under PENALTY OF PERJURY under the paragraph is true and correct.	laws of the State of California that the foregoing
WITNESS my hand and official seal.	
	(Seal)
Motary Public	V

TO ZONING PROTEST APPLICATION

- 1. Prezoning Paves the Way for Streamlined Annexation Without Protest. The Prezoning is proposed in conjunction with and is a necessary prerequisite to the City of San Jose's intended streamlined "urban pocket" annexation (pursuant to Government Code § 56375.3) of approximately 103 gross acres, consisting of 330 parcels in unincorporated Santa Clara County, which is commonly known as Cambrian 36. Cambrian 36 encompasses my property and borders both the City of Campbell and the City of San Jose.
- Prezoning Directly Contradicts City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 Property 2. Owners Requests. The Prezoning is the first step of a unilateral effort initiated by the City of San Jose to annex Cambrian 36 - an effort which directly contradicts the stated desire of both the City of Campbell and Cambrian 36 property owners to annex Cambrian 36 into the City of Campbell. In October of 2006, a petition signed by 204 Cambrian 36 property owners was presented to the City of Campbell asking that it be annexed to the City of Campbell. In response, the City of Campbell directed its staff to pursue two different possibilities for annexation of Cambrian 36, one which received preliminary support from City of San Jose staff. Councilmember Judy Chirco, citing an inapplicable 1984 city policy (concerning de-annexation), quashed this effort. Despite this disappointing response, both Campbell's and Cambrian 36 property owners' interest in annexing Cambrian 36 remains unequivocal. As recently expressed in the Mayor of Campbell's letter to the Mayor of San Jose dated September 2, 2010, "Campbell welcomes the annexation of the Cambrian #36 pocket into our city. The residents have Campbell mailing addresses, identify with Campbell, and stated a clear preference to be part of Campbell."
- 3. Prezoning Will Result in Annexation that Will Not Benefit My Property. My property will not benefit from the City of San Jose's intended annexation that will result from the proposed Prezoning. On the contrary, it will result in a downgrade of my current services received from the County of Santa Clara at an increased cost. The City of San Jose does not currently provide Cambrian 36 residents any services and it has not provided any indication that it is capable of meeting the standard of services that we currently receive. Furthermore, it has not resolved the pressing issue of the City's ability to provide fire

- 4. <u>Staff Analysis of Prezoning is Insufficient</u>. Staff has not provided a sufficient analysis of how the proposed Prezoning compares with my property's existing County zoning. For example, it has not explained or analyzed how the permitted and conditional uses in the proposed zone will compare with what uses are currently allowed under my property's existing zoning. Nor has it provided a comparison of floor area ratios and densities etc. Further, it has not provided sufficient analysis of what existing legal uses would become legal non-conforming. As such, it is impossible for me to understand and evaluate the affect of the Prezoning on my property.
- 5. Environmental Review of Prezoning Violates CEQA. Environmental review of the Prezoning has not been conducted in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act ("CEQA"). the City of San Jose's attempted reliance on the San José 2020 General Plan Environmental Impact Report ("EIR") is legally inadequate. The EIR was certified as complete on August 16, 1994 more than 16 years ago and is not current nor accurate. Since its certification, new information of substantial importance to the Prezoning that was not known and could not have been known at the time the EIR was certified as complete is now available (such as changes in urban service area, changes in population, changes in provision of services, public infrastructure etc.). As such, a supplemental or subsequent EIR would need to be prepared in order to include new information since the certification date. At the very minimum, an addendum to the EIR is required to make minor corrections or changes. See Public Resources Code § 21166 and 14 Cal. Code Regs § 15162.
- 6. Public Hearing Notice Violated City and State Notice Requirements. Notice for the San Jose Planning Commission August 25th public hearing on the Prezoning failed to comply with the City's own notice policies and State Planning & Zoning notice requirements. Despite repeated requests for deferral from Cambrian 36 property owners based on this insufficient notice as well as lack of staff analysis and inadequate CEQA review, the Planning Commission refused to grant the deferral request and instead recommended the Prezoning for the City Council's approval. As such, the Planning Commission's recommendation is null and void and the City Council's consideration of the Prezoning is premature and does not comply with Municipal Code § 20.120.030(B).